

Applicant : William Lin
Serial No. : 10/665,156
Filed : September 18, 2003
Page : 9 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-610001 / P563

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 19 2007

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination. Claims 1-30 were pending as of the action mailed on October 19, 2006. Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, and 28 are amended. Claims 31-32 are new. Claims 5 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is added. Support for the amended claim language may be found on page 6 of the applicant's specification. The applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of any cancelled claims in one or more continuing or divisional applications.

The examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US Patent Pub. No. US 2004/0177315 A1 ("Brown").

Reconsideration is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant kindly thanks Examiner Maikhanh Nguyen for the courtesy of an in-person interview with the applicant's representative, Arrienne M. Lezak on January 12, 2007. The interview was greatly appreciated. The applicant's representative described the invention. Additionally, claims 1 to 30 were discussed in light of Brown. The applicant's representative further described how Brown fails to disclose or suggest features of the claims. To overcome the Brown reference, the examiner recommended the incorporation of the subject matter found in dependent claim 5 into each independent claim.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected over Brown. Claim 1, as amended, recites identifying a structural aspect of the structured electronic document that fails to conform to rules of a markup language format. The rules including one or more rules deduced from the structure of the structured electronic document and being associated with the structured electronic document.

The examiner states that Brown discloses rules deduced from the structure of the structured electronic document. The applicant disagrees.

Brown discloses the use of an external binding document for storing rules applicable to the structured electronic document. These rules are then used to bind user actions when editing

Applicant : William Lin
Serial No. : 10/665,156
Filed : September 18, 2003
Page : 10 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-610001 / P563

files. Thus, Brown merely limits which user actions may be taken regarding a particular electronic document.

Specifically, the examiner states that Brown discloses the claimed feature at paragraph 58. Paragraph 58 reads as follows:

A bounding file may be considered as embodying a set of rules, where these rules conform to the bounding DTD and specify how a document instance (such as XML document 310) created according to a different DTD (such as DTD 300) can be edited. Arrow 335 indicates that XML bounding files 330, 331 are related to XML document 310 in this manner.

The cited paragraph discloses that the bounding file can include a set of rules and that these rules specify how a document instance can be edited. However, the cited portion does not disclose or suggest that the rules are deduced from the structure of the structured electronic document. Disclosure in Brown that rules exist does not disclose or suggest how the rules are determined.

The applicant submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-4 and 6-12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 13, 16, and 28, as amended, each recite deducing rules from the structure of the structured electronic document. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, Brown does not disclose or suggest deducing rules from the structure of the structured electronic document. The applicant submits that claims 13, 16, and 28, as well as claims 14-15, 17-24, 26-27, and 29-30, which depend from independent claims 13, 16, and 28, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 stands rejected over Brown. Claim 10, as amended, recites suggesting a plurality of changes to a user which would correct the identified structural aspect.

The examiner relies on paragraph 51 of Brown as disclosing suggesting a plurality changes to a user which would correct the identified structural aspect. The cited paragraph in Brown reads as follows:

After a bounding document type definition ("DTD") is completed, an XML bounding file can be written (for example, by a product development team) under restriction of the bounding DTD. A processing component (which, in preferred embodiments, operates within an editing component) then reads in this XML

Applicant : William Lin
Serial No. : 10/665,156
Filed : September 18, 2003
Page : 11 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-610001 / P563

bounding file and, based on its specified restrictions, provides a set of editing actions that limit the user in what he can see and do with an XML element. This XML bounding file can then be changed, if desired, so that the processing component acts differently, depending on the revised restrictions in the XML bounding file. Thus, editing operations available in the same component (and on the same input XML file for which editing is to be bounded) can be tailored to different users with diverse needs or different tasks as long as there is a different implementation of the XML bounding file. (Emphasis added)

The cited paragraphs of Brown teach a means by which a product development team may tailor a bounding file to different users with diverse needs or different tasks. Specifically, in paragraph 51, no changes are suggested to the user, and someone other than the user is making a change to the file. In contrast, claim 10, as amended, requires that a plurality of changes are suggested to the user, and the user makes a selection from the suggested changes.

Moreover, the cited paragraph discloses that the change to the bounding file provides a set of editing actions that limit the user in what he can see and do with an XML element. Thus, Brown merely allows someone other than the user to limit which user actions may be taken regarding a particular electronic document. Providing a set of editing actions, however, is distinct from suggesting more than one change to correct a structural aspect of a structured electronic document. The cited paragraph of Brown does not disclose or suggest that a plurality of changes, which would correct an identified structural aspect, are suggested to the user.

The examiner seeks additional support in paragraphs 52-60 of Brown. These paragraphs further disclose features of the bounding file and the rules that can be included in the bounding file. These additional paragraphs of Brown do not disclose or suggest providing a user with a plurality of suggested changes. Furthermore, the cited paragraphs fail to provide any disclosure or suggestion that a user can be presented with a plurality of suggested changes to correct an identified structural aspect.

The applicant submits that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 25 includes features corresponding to those of claim 10 and stands rejected for the same reasons. Applicant submits that claim 25 is allowable for the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 10.

Applicant : William Lin
Serial No. : 10/665,156
Filed : September 18, 2003
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-610001 / P563

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 19 2007

New Claims

Claims 31-32 recite suggesting changes to the user in an order determined by a calculated statistical likelihood of correctness. The examiner states that Brown discloses the recited feature at paragraphs 51-60. However, the cited paragraphs do not disclose or suggest that changes are suggested to a user in an order determined by a calculated statistical likelihood of correctness. The applicant submits that claims 31-32 are in condition for allowance.

Drawings

The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that the replacement drawing sheets FIGS. 1 and 2 filed on July 31, 2006, are acceptable.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply \$400 for additional claims to deposit account no. 06-1050. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19 January, 2007

Brian Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978 For
Arrienne M. Lezak
Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No.: 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50394946.doc